

THE DIVISIONS IN THE PLAYS OF PLAUTUS

A Thesis presented to the Faculty of Literature,
Science and the Arts of the University of Michigan
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

BY

FREDERICK M. FOSTER

(With a chapter on The Divisions in the Plays of Terence.
Reprinted from the State University of Iowa Studies in
Language and Literature)

1913

53646.
IN THE SERIES OF RESEARCH BULLETINS OF THE UNIVERSITY

STUDIES

IN

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

VOLUME I

NUMBER 3



CONTENTS

The divisions in the plays of Plautus and Terence

F. M. FOSTER



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

THE DIVISIONS IN THE PLAYS OF PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

I

The plays of Plautus, as they appear in the manuscripts, are rigidly divided into five acts each, and each act is divided into one or more scenes. It is not known just when this division was made, and one purpose of this paper is to show that the traditional division was not made by Plautus. Such a division is undeniably useful from the modern point of view for the breaks in the play are utilized by scene-shifters, but in the time of Plautus the play had to be presented as a continuous whole¹ for otherwise the spectators would think that the play had come to an end and would leave the theatre. Plautus however did make certain divisions in his plays, and I shall endeavor to locate the division points according to criteria which will be shown to exist in the plays themselves.

There are many reasons for believing that the traditional division into acts and scenes was not made by Plautus. If these reasons are valid we ought to reject this division, and then endeavor to see where the original divisions existed; if we conclude that it was necessary for the plays to have some sort of dividing points. We may first consider the division into scenes. Various arguments have been advanced against the traditional division, chief among which are the statement by Leo² that it is a nuisance to the reader, and that by West³ that it is merely a device to show the entrance and exit of actors. West has adduced no proof in support of his position and so it may be well to examine this subject in some detail. In the first place we have no reason to believe that Plautus himself made a division into scenes, because no such division exists in Greek comedy either Old or New, and therefore Plautus had no model to follow in this respect. He however recognized the necessity of

¹ Wessner, *Donatus*, praef. Eun. p. 266.

² *Plaut. Forsch.* p. 13, n. 3.

³ *Terence*, And. and Heaut. p. XXVI.

providing some means to indicate the entrance and exit of actors, and so he naturally chose the same means which Menander and Aristophanes had used before him; that is, the employment of statements by the actors themselves to indicate departure from or entrance onto the stage. At these places in the play we now have the division into scenes which is nothing more than a list of the names of those characters who are about to participate in the action. These lists are noticeably incorrect for they not only frequently omit the names of characters who were on the stage, but also they do not consistently occur where we have reason to expect them.⁴ The statements made by the actors are such as these: to indicate departure, *ibo intro* or *eo ad forum*; to indicate entrance, *eccum video* or *fores crepuerunt*. Since, then, there is no reason to believe that Plautus knew anything about scene-division, and since the text contains statements which are sufficient to show the entrance and exit of actors, we appear to be justified in rejecting the traditional division into scenes.

There now remains for consideration the division into acts. As the plays exist in the manuscripts they each have five acts, and the natural assumption is that at each of these divisions the stage is vacant, the plot has reached a decisive point in its development, and there is general preparation for the next act. Passing by the suspicion that such regularity of division is somewhat alarming in a production naturally so free and untrammelled as was early Latin comedy, we find upon examining the different act ends that the three assumptions above mentioned have no basis in fact. There are many divisions made when the stage is not vacant, and, in addition, there are many breaks which do not coincide with breaks incident to the development of the plot. A further reason for suspecting a formal quinquepartite division is the fact that no such division existed in Greek comedy. We are therefore justified in rejecting the traditional act-division also.

Was it necessary for Plautus to make any sort of division when writing his plays? The structure of a play which has any plot at all requires at least three parts: (1) the development of the situation; (2) the living under the situation; (3)

⁴ cf. Rudens 688-885.

the resolution of the difficulties which have arisen. These divisions should be marked off from each other with at least a fair degree of clearness. If we add a prologue and an epilogue, we arrive at a five-part division, but parts are not necessarily identical with acts. We find in Aristophanes great freedom in the number of the episodes which occur after the prologue, and the number of divisions in one of his comedies may even go as high as eight. We may therefore conclude that a comedy contained as many divisions as were occasioned by the necessities of the situation which developed in the construction of the play.

In order to discuss intelligently the divisions in the plays of Plautus, we must endeavor to formulate for ourselves the influences under which he wrote. One of the most potent of these influences was Greek comedy.

In the plays of Aristophanes there are three main parts: prologue, episodes, and exodus; in addition the plays may have a *parodos* and a *parabasis*. The prologue may be regarded as a complete whole, but each episode forms a division by itself with choral songs marking them off, and there may be from four to six of these episodes. Regarding the exodus as a division, we may have eight divisions separated from each other by choral songs. Other signs apart from the chorus indicate such separation. At the times when the chorus absorbed the attention of the audience, e. g. in the *parodos* and *parabasis*, the actors left the stage, and so, disregarding the chorus, there was no one left to occupy the stage. Vacant stage thus assumes great importance as a criterion for the indication of a break between divisions, and, as we have seen, the actors usually announce their departure definitely, and so we have little difficulty in ascertaining when the stage was empty. Furthermore, the identity of the character who was to open the succeeding episode was not revealed until he started to speak. We have thus, independently of the choral song, three criteria to indicate a division: (1) express statements by the actors that they are about to leave the stage; (2) vacant stage; (3) no clue given as to the identity of the oncoming actor. Of these three criteria, vacant stage was noticed by Donatus, but the other two seem to have escaped the notice of commentators.

By the time of Menander the chorus had so far declined in importance that it no longer took an essential part in the play. The Aphroditopolis papyrus has shown that the chorus was used solely to occupy, by some sort of entertainment, an otherwise vacant stage. A break in the action of the play was essential, and this break was filled in by a very ordinary sort of performance, as that of the drunken youths in the *Periceiomene*. Thus the difference between the chorus of Aristophanes and that of Menander is that the former made the chorus an active participant in the economy of the play, while the latter used it merely as a source of entertainment. This decline in importance of the chorus is a significant fact in connection with the present discussion. If the chorus, in the space of a century, could so fall from the position which it enjoyed during the height of Attic comedy, it is certainly reasonable to infer that, when comedy started in Rome under the hand of Plautus, the chorus ceased altogether to exist.⁵ In fact Euanthius⁶ and Donatus⁷ both express doubt as to where the proper places for the chorus are. I believe that all doubt on the question as to whether Plautus used a chorus or not can be resolved by the statement of Donatus, *vult poeta noster omnes quinque actus velut unum fieri*. It is true that this statement is made concerning Terence but it is reasonable to believe that its force applies as well to Plautus. If the poet wished the play to be performed with no intermission between acts, because the spectators might think that the play had come to an end and so would leave the theatre, it is not reasonable to infer the existence of a chorus, for a chorus would bring about precisely the ends which the poet wished to avoid. The same argument applies to the inference that there was music between the acts. The problem now before us is to determine whether the criteria which have been found to apply to Aristophanes and Menander, will have equal force for Plautus.

Of the criteria mentioned, vacant stage is the most important, for it is apparent that when no one is on the stage nothing can happen. Conversely, if characters remain on the stage there can be no division, for the action must be regarded as continu-

⁵ Adverse to this view, see Flickinger, *Class. Phil.* VII, I. Cf. also Leo, *Hermes* XLVI, 2. p. 292. ⁶ Wessner, *op. cit.* p. 18. ⁷ Wessner, *op. cit.* praef. Adel. p. 4, praef. And. p. 38.

ous. But there are certain difficulties in the way of being always certain that the stage is vacant and these difficulties have given rise to mistakes on the part of commentators. Characters have remained on the stage as mutes and have been supposed not to be there, as *Rudens* 688-885, where Palaestra and Ampelisca stay *in ara* and leave without speaking. Then there is such a question as arises at *Asinaria* 126: Libanus announces his departure and leaves at 117; Demaenetus similarly leaves at 126; there is vacant stage, and no clue is given as to who will enter. Should a division be indicated so soon after the beginning of the play? It may be possible that there is a variation in the kinds, so to speak, of vacant stage. Certain occasions of vacant stage undeniably indicate divisions in the play and other occasions do not; yet at all these points the stage is empty. A solution of this difficulty may lie in assuming a different length of wait for these two classes of vacant stage. If a break in the action is demanded because the plot has attained a certain point in its development, the wait will be just long enough to be apparent to the audience. At these times we mark a division point. If the stage appears vacant to us as we read, but no division is demanded by the development of the plot, we must assume that this occasion of vacant stage was almost non-existent in time because the oncoming actor closely followed the outgoing one. It would not be justifiable to indicate a division point at these places.

Certain other considerations will also assist us in determining when the stage may properly be termed vacant. One of these considerations is that the range of the third criterion, viz. no clue being given as to the identity of the oncoming actor, may be expanded to include that portion of the play which immediately precedes the point at issue. A good example of this point is to be found in the *Trinummus*. At 614 Callicles says, *ibo ad meum castigatorem atque ab eo consilium petam*, and then leaves the stage to carry out his announced intention. At 728, the stage is apparently empty for Lysiteles has departed at 716, Stasimus announces his departure at 727, and there is no immediate sign of entrance. But Callicles enters with his *castigator*, Megaronides, and they converse on the question of the dowry which has been troubling Callicles. It is ap-

parent that 728 cannot be considered as a division-point because the succeeding subject-matter is closely linked to that which was being discussed at the last appearance of Callicles, and his remark just quoted must be considered as showing that he was about to re-enter the stage and so it is a clue as to his reappearance.

A second consideration may, for want of a better single name, be termed *insidiae*. There are numerous occasions when an actor retires to some secret place on the stage, in order that he may overhear a conversation. This device is also common in the modern drama, as any one will recall. Apparently three places on the Roman stage were employed for this purpose: *angiportus*, or alley-way between the houses;⁸ *ara*, the actor either concealing himself behind it, or else grasping it for protection; and *ianua* or *ostium* where he hid behind a pillar. We find conventional phrases which are used to indicate such withdrawal, as *concede huc*; we need not necessarily believe that the actor had to be entirely hidden, because the audience must be kept aware of the fact that he was on the stage. If, then, an actor has retired to the *insidiae*, the stage cannot be termed vacant even if there are times when no other actor is in view. The whole point can well be summed up by referring to *Miles* 595. Here there is an undoubted division for all the criteria are in evidence. Then Palaestrio appears and looks about *ne uspiam insidiae sient*, so that they may safely converse.

Leo⁹ deals with the monologue as a criterion to indicate the ancient divisions. Monologues may accompany a division but a division-point does not necessarily exist wherever there are monologues. No generalization as to the value of this criterion can be made, but a close comparison of the results obtained by Leo with those which are obtained by the application of our three criteria to the plays will show that the monologue is not an unfailing criterion.

It may now be profitable to apply our criteria to the plays. For present purposes the prologues will be disregarded.

AMPHITRUO. The division-points according to our criteria occur at 550, 860, and 1052, thus forming four divisions. Leo

⁸ Asin. 741.

⁹ Der Monolog im Drama, pp. 49-62 for Plautus.

arrived at practically the same results but he included one more section, viz. 860-983, thus finding five divisions. Against this conclusion is the statement of Jupiter in 976, *Nunc tu, divine Sosia, huc fac adsies*. This command serves as an announcement of the entrance of Mercury, and hence violates the criterion that no clue as to the identity of the oncoming actor be given. Our divisions correspond with the acts indicated in the MSS., except that we do not allow a division-point at 1008 which is the end of Act III. Mercury at 1005 announces the entrance of Amphitruo with the words *eccum Amphitruonem; advent*. This announcement of entrance violates the same criterion as that just mentioned, and so 1008 cannot be a division point. One might contend that a division-point does not exist at 1052 because Amphitruo was struck by Jupiter just before leaving the stage, fell down apparently dead, and so vacant stage could not be said really to exist as Amphitruo was still in sight. Strictly speaking, this contention would hold, but as a matter of fact Amphitruo was for the moment non-existent on account of the blow, and, for dramatic purposes, the stage was empty. This occurrence is unique among the plays of Plautus, and does not come under the head of *insidiae* for Amphitruo was not feigning unconsciousness nor had he any reason so to do.

ASINARIA. The division points in this play are at 248, 503, 544, 745, and 827, thus making six divisions. Leo would mark a division at 126, does not mention 544, and finally indicates a division point at 809 rather than at 827. These variations are all worthy of comment. The question of the division point at 126 is at best a dubious one, as was said above. The criterion of no clue as to the identity of the oncoming actor is of particular service at this point. The difficulty should be cleared up if it can be shown that the entrance of Argyrippus has been announced, for if it has been announced no division-point can be made at 126. The following lines may be noted: 74-5, *nam hodie me oravit Argyrippus filius uti sibi amanti facerem argenti copiam*; 116; *apud Archibulum ego ero argentarium*; 126, *manebo apud argentarium*. These lines are all spoken by Demaenetus and show clearly that his purpose in leaving the stage is to secure for his son Argyrippus a sum of money. Argyrippus has not yet appeared

on the stage, but when he comes on at 127 he delivers an indignant monologue against Cleareta, whose entrance is announced by the words *eccam inlecebra exit*. I believe that the lines quoted serve as an announcement of entrance which is clear enough to forbid a division at 126, and in addition, the development of the plot does not allow a division point until 248.

Leo would mark a division at 503 but not at 544. To be sure, forty-one lines is rather a small number for a division, though not a prohibitively small number. The evidence given by the criteria must decide the difficulty. We have first the departure of Philaenium at the command of Cleareta, *intro abi*, and that she did depart is shown by 585, *Philaenium estne haec quae intus exit atque una Argyrippus?* No express announcement of the departure of Cleareta is made, but she probably left with Philaenium as she does not appear again during the play. There is no announcement of the entrance of Libanus and Leonida and there is vacant stage. Leo probably did not mark a division on account of the absence of monologues, but this is not an invariable criterion. The division is of importance, because in it Cleareta forbids Philaenium to have anything more to do with Argyrippus. For these reasons I indicate a division-point at 544. There are two difficulties connected with the question as to whether there should be a division-point at 809 or at 827. In the first place, as Scaliger has noted, the text is undoubtedly corrupt; secondly, the conversation before and after 809 is practically continuous. Our criteria show a division at 827 and consequently there can hardly be one at 809 as eighteen lines is too small a number for a section. There are a number of instances where a break occurs in the manuscripts with the same characters on either side of it.¹⁰ Occasionally these breaks coincide with original division points, but a further examination must be made before a general rule can be formulated.

AULULARIA. We find division points at 119, 279, 370, 586, and 681, thus making six divisions. Leo refuses to allow a division-point at 586 and one might think that he regards 370-807 as one division. Against his conclusion is the fact that all

¹⁰ Aul. 78. Bacch. 169, 385, 572, Cist. 630, Curc. 462, Merc. 543, 691, 802, Mil. 1394, Persa 52, 250, Pseud. 573a, Sti. 672.

the criteria, together with monologues, are in evidence at this point: Megadorus announces departure at 579, *eo lavatum*; Euclio departs at 586 with the words *ibo ad te*; there is vacant stage and no clue is given as to the identity of the oncoming actor.

In this play our criteria render a service towards the rehabilitation of the text. At 363, according to the manuscripts, Pythodicus makes his sole appearance. The whole scene has been carefully discussed by Goetz¹¹ with the conclusion that, owing to the process of *retractatio*, the name Strobilus has in some unknown manner been changed to Pythodicius. Goetz admits that certain solution is attended with great difficulty. I believe that the name Pythodicius should be changed to Strobilus for the following reasons: Strobilus does not announce his departure while departure is provided for Staphyla, Congrio, the cooks, and others by the words of Strobilus in 362, *duc istos intro*, and so it would seem that Plautus had intended that Strobilus should remain on the stage; no new entrance is announced; the speech in 363-70 harmonizes with the words of Strobilus in 351-2; and finally, with a division point at 370, the division comes to an end with the usual monologue, and in no other instance in Plautus is such a final monologue spoken by any other than one of the actors who has recently been on the stage. The introduction of a new character in such a situation is unparalleled. For these reasons, in addition to the other possible reasons which are mentioned by Goetz, I believe that the speech in 363-70 must be assigned to Strobilus.

BACCHIDES. The division points are at 108, 367, 525, 572, 924, and 1075, thus making seven divisions. Leo includes 169, though in a note he admits some doubt as to whether it is really a division point, and says nothing about 572. It is true that the departure of both Pistoclerus and Lydus is indicated at 169 by the words *sequere hac me ac tace*, and that no clue as to the coming of Chrysalus is given. Our criteria would seem to indicate a break were it not for the words of Pistoclerus, which show that he saw Chrysalus coming before he had left the stage, and so, *vadatam amore*,¹² he had remained on the

¹¹ praef. Aul. p. VIII.

¹² qui abire hinc nullo pacto possum, si velim; ita me vadatum amore vinctumque attines, 180-1.

stage in silence until Chrysalus had finished his opening speech. This is the second of the instances referred to above, in connection with the *Asinaria*, and we may anticipate somewhat so that the present point may be perfectly clear. At *Asinaria* 809 no division should be made because the apparent break served only to separate two successive appearances of the same characters whose conversation should have been continuous. At *Cistellaria* 630 and at *Curculio* 461 real divisions occur which separate similar appearances but in both of these cases there are monologues—in the former, that of Melaenis, in the latter, that of the choragus. In the *Mercator* we find three places, 543, 691, 802, where no real division exists but monologues are spoken which separate two successive appearances of the same character. We thus seem to be justified in formulating a general rule: when we have two successive appearances of the same character which are separated by a monologue spoken by a character who remains on the stage, no real division-point exists either immediately before or after the monologue, unless departure is expressly announced. This rule is not violated at *Cistellaria* 630 because Melaenis leaves the stage.

With regard to 572 Leo states "ohne Pause anzuschliessen ist 572." Notwithstanding this statement our criteria point to a division here. The departure of both Pistoclerus and Mnesilochus is indicated at 572, there is vacant stage, and no clue is given as to the identity of the oncoming parasite who opens with a monologue. The principle enunciated in the preceding paragraph is not violated here because the poet has taken express care to show that Pistoclerus had left the stage.

The question as to whether a division-point exists at 924, as Leo intimates, presents certain difficulties. Chrysalus retires at 912 only to reappear at 924, when he begins a long monologue. There is no sign of departure for Nicobulus and in 978 Chrysalus says *sed Priamum astantem eccum ante portam video*, but the question of Nicobulus in 979, *quoianam vox prope me sonat?* would seem to indicate that he had just entered the stage. Our criteria are not so clear at this point as they usually are, but recourse to the development of the plot shows the possibility of a division: Chrysalus merely must get the letter from the son of Nicobulus, and this fact accounts for his short absence; his

monologue in mythological fashion informs the audience of the progress of his schemes; the delivery of the letter to Nicobulus might well start a new division which would be opened by the monologue of Chrysalus. Opposed to this view is the principle enunciated above, for two successive appearances of Nicobulus are separated by the monologue of Chrysalus, and he remains on the stage. The point cannot be settled with absolute certainty, but the probabilities are that a division-point should be indicated at 924 on account of the fact that the development of the plot requires a division-point here, and also because the general tone of Chrysalus' monologue shows that he feels the necessity of acquainting the audience with the progress of his schemes; this fact would properly open a new division.

A division-point might be imagined at 384, but Lydus probably merely retired to one side of the stage so as not to interfere with the monologue of Mnesilochus. There he met Philoxenus and together they came on at the signal, *sed eccos video incedere patrem scdalis et magistrum*. One might postulate a break just after 520 but stage cannot be vacant for Pistoclerus could not have left before Mnesilochus came on.

CAPTIVI. In this play we find for the first time an exact correspondence between the act divisions as they appear in the manuscripts and the divisions established by our criteria at 194, 460, 767, 921. Leo however indicates only four divisions, as he would terminate the first at 460. He makes no comment on this decision. I think it certain that a division-point occurs at 194, as all the criteria are in evidence with the possible exception of the monologues. It has already been shown that we do not always find all of the criteria in active operation, and also that monologues alone are not sufficient evidence upon which to establish a division-point.

In this play we notice certain speeches which call for detailed attention, those at 497, 515, and 908. The last speech has been discussed by Prescott¹³ with the conclusion that it gives to Ergasilus, who has just spoken, time to change his rôle. Leo says, "der Monolog des puer ist neutral." He also compares the parasite's monologue in 461 and suggests that the two monologues of the parasite, like that of the choragus in the *Curculio*,

¹³ Harv. Stud. XXI, p. 38.

take the place of a XOPOY. With regard to the present discussion, it may be noted that the three speeches all show the possible conclusion that division-points should be indicated just before they severally begin. However we may add that, while some of the criteria are present, we are not justified in indicating divisions for these speeches are explanatory of action which has occurred off the stage, and hence division-points cannot be said to exist at these places. The question as to possible changes of rôle does not lie within the compass of this paper.

CASINA. In this play the division points are at 143, 514, 758, and 954, with exact correspondence to the tradition act-divisions, and also to those marked by Leo.

CISTELLARIA. This play cannot be satisfactorily discussed on account of the existence of numerous lacunae and fragments. The division-points are at 148, 202, 630, and 652. Leo intimates that there may be a division-point at 304, but I believe that this possibility ought to be ignored because the following fragments render it too difficult a matter to decide. The speech of Auxilium, 148-202, presents a situation which has not been encountered thus far. It is really the prologue to the play, and yet it does not come at the beginning. We have been disregarding the vacant stage which usually exists at the end of the prologue, and for that reason we have one division-point here (148) that really ought not to be counted, but we are forced to allow it because the prologue is not in its usual place and we have no means, except violent transposition, of restoring it. At 630 a situation occurs similar to that of *Asinaria* 809, namely that the same character speaks both before and after the break. In all probability the break was very short, as is indicated by the words *rem elocuta sum tibi omnem*, and just enough time was allowed for Melaenis to disappear and to reappear with Sele-nium. With regard to 652 Leo states, "652 kann unmittelbar anschliessen." But this is not the case, for all of our criteria, with the single exception of the monologue, show a division-point at this place. The departure of Alcesimarchus with Sele-nium is shown by the words *abiit, apstulit mulierem*, and the departure of Melaenis by the words *ibo, persequar iam illum intro*; there is vacant stage; and no clue is given as to the identity of the oncoming actors. The absence of monologues is not a suffi-

cient reason why a division point should not be indicated at this place. One might imagine a division point at 773, but this cannot be, for Lampadio did not leave the stage before Demipho appeared.

CURCULIO. The divisions of this play correspond exactly with the traditional act-divisions and are 215, 370, 461, and 590. Leo however does not allow a division-point at 590. All of our criteria indicate it for Cappadox departs at 588 and Therapontigonius at 590; there is vacant stage; no clue as to the identity of the oncoming Curculio is given; and in addition we find short monologues both before and after the break. The speech of the choragus, 462-86, has aroused some comment. Leo calls it a "richtiges Intermezzo" and it might be taken as giving an opportunity for change of rôle.¹⁴ For our purposes, however, it may be considered as serving the same end as the other speeches mentioned in connection with *Asinaria* 809, viz. to separate two successive appearances of the same set of actors. The existence of such speeches as these strengthens our hypothesis that Plautus used no chorus because these speeches admirably fill in an otherwise awkward pause. Furthermore, they show that the play was to be presented as a fairly continuous whole, because such pains are taken to occupy the stage during a wait caused by the disappearance and reappearance of the same set of actors.

EPIDICUS. Division-points exist at 165, 319, 381, and 606. Leo has the same results. It might appear at first sight that there is a division-point at 525 but Periphanes remains on the stage as is indicated by the word *peregre* of 533. There is a possibility also at 665, because Epidicus announces his departure, *abeo intro*, and we have no clue as to who will next appear. Leo states that no division point is to be found here and I am inclined to agree because there is no monologue at the entrance of Periphanes and Apocides, and the general tone of Epidicus' remarks, 675-8, does not indicate that he had just entered the stage.

MENAECHMI. We find division-points at 225, 445, 558, 700, and 965. Leo says, "fünf, nicht sechs oder sieben, denn sowohl V. 558 als 1049 geht das Spiel weiter;" in other words, neither

¹⁴ cf. Prescott, op. cit. p. 26, n. 3.

558 nor 1049 are division-points. 1049 is certainly a division-point for the statement of Messenio in 1038, *hic me mane*, is equivalent to an announcement of entrance and hence there is no break at 1049. With regard to 558 I am also unable to agree with Leo. The *ancilla* departs at 548 as is shown by the words of Menaechmus II in 550,¹⁵ and he himself departs at 558. No clue is given as to the identity of the oncoming actors, and the stage is vacant. In addition to these reasons there is a monologue to close the division and the plot demands a break at this place.

The new divisions correspond with the traditional acts except that we indicate a break at 965. This break is demanded by the announced departure of the three characters, vacant stage, no clue as to the identity of the oncoming Messenio, and the monologue by Menaechmus which closes the division and the one by Messenio which opens the next division; the development of the plot also necessitates this break, for, after the departure of the old man and the doctor, the seizure of Menaechmus and his rescue by Messenio fittingly begin the scene introductory to the recognition of the two Menaechmi.

MERCATOR. Our division-points occur at 224, 498, 587, 666, and 829, and the same results are found by Leo. He puts together 543, 691, and 802 with the intimation that they do not mark divisions, but he adduces no proof for his statement. In the absence of his proof it may be well to examine the three places. At 543 Demipho begins a monologue which separates the two appearances of Lysimachus; at 691 Lysimachus has a monologue which separates the appearances of Dorippa; at 789 Lysimachus' monologue performs the same service for Syra. We have already anticipated the treatment of this point in connection with the *Bacchides*. Suffice it to say here that the first character leaves the stage to fulfill his part in the economy of the play, and the monologue is spoken in order to fill up the pause which would otherwise result.

MILES GLORIOSUS. Our division points occur at 78, 595, 946, and 1393, in correspondence with the traditional act-divisions. Leo indicates but three parts "nach dem Vorspiel, Einschnitte sind 595 und 946 (nicht 1394)." Presumably he would mark

¹⁵ abiit, operuit fores.

a division at 78, since the speech of Palaestrio which follows is really the prologue as is the speech of *Auxilium* in the *Cistellaria*. The few lines just preceding 1394 (1378-93) have been discussed by Prescott¹⁶ with the conclusion that the *puer* speech was written for the purpose of allowing the *miles* to retire into his house preparatory to his reappearance in the next division. This in itself is proof enough that a division-point exists at 1393, for there the *puer* departs. We may recall the principle enunciated in connection with the *Bacchides*. Since the *puer* speech separates the two appearances of Pyrgopolinices and the *puer* then leaves the stage, we appear to be justified in claiming a division-point at 1393. Leo gives no reason why he refuses a division here, but possibly he regarded the matter included in 946-1347 as an unbroken whole as he indicates.¹⁷

MOSTELLARIA. This play brings us face to face with a new situation. According to our criteria the play has only three divisions with division-points at 858 and 1040. This makes a first division which is out of proportion to the other two sections, or to any other division which we have had thus far. Leo admits this same division of the play according to the criterion of vacant stage, but he would find "Aktschlüsse" at both 347 and at 431, and he says "Das Stück hat wirklich 5 Akte." He then adds that Tranio's function caused him to remain on the stage "bis zum volligen Gelingen" as did Medea and Hecuba in the plays of Euripides. I think that this contention of Leo's vitiates his theory of division making. He admits certain divisions where the stage is vacant and then proceeds to postulate two division-points at which the stage under no conceivable circumstances can be vacant, for at 347 three persons remain on the stage, and at 431 Tranio retires to the *insidiae*. It would undeniably be convenient, from the modern point of view, to have these five divisions but they do not exist in the play. Apparently Plautus did not intend to have any division-point until 858, because he purposely kept Tranio on the stage until his machinations were concluded, and not until then was he allowed to leave. The contention of Leo proves that he does not regard vacant stage as necessary and indispensable for a division-

¹⁶ op. cit. p. 34 ff.

¹⁷ Plaut. Forsch. p. 161. Cf. Prescott, loc. cit. n. 1.

point. This is not a tenable position for how can there be a break in the action when persons remain on the stage?

PERSA. The division-points are 167, 250, 328, 399, 752. Leo has the same results but adds 52. This cannot be a division-point, as may be shown by comparison with *Mercator* 543, 691, and 802 at which points Leo does not allow breaks. The cases are identical as in all four we find monologues which separate successive appearances of the same actor. In this case the monologue of Saturio separates two successive appearances of Toxilus. If Leo did not allow divisions in the *Mercator*, he should not mark one here.

POENULUS. There is little to say concerning this play as the new divisions correspond both with the traditional act-divisions and also with those established by Leo.

PSEUDOLUS. The division-points are 573a, 766, 904, 1051, and 1245. The same results are given by Leo. These divisions correspond with the traditional act-divisions with one exception, viz. that Act IV must be divided at 1051. All of our criteria indicate a division at this point, and in addition a break is demanded by the development of the plot, for, by the departure of Simia and Pseudolus, opportunity is given for the development of the schemes of Simo and Ballio.

The division-point at 573a has given rise to endless comment, for this is one of the few places where a hint is given as to the occupancy of vacant stage. As this subject is foreign to the present investigation, I will not touch on it further than to say that, as in *Cistellaria* 630, a break must exist in order to furnish time for the departure and reappearance of Pseudolus. The remark of Pseudolus, *interea vos tibicen hic delectaverit*, is doubtless a joke, and he takes the audience into his confidence as Aristophanes does often.

RUDENS. This play is particularly interesting from the present view-point as it affords considerable opportunity for nice work in the discrimination of vacant stage. Our criteria point to divisions at 289, 592, 891, 1190, and 1280, thus making six divisions. Leo finds seven as he adds a division-point at 184. I cannot concur in this for the entrance of Palaestra is demanded by the previous conversation which reported the shipwreck, and in addition the words *errabit illaec hodie* of 177 practically

announce her entrance. As the criterion of announcement of entrance was not observed by Leo he marked a division-point at 184. Possibly vacant stage occurs at 457 but here again there is practical announcement of entrance, for Sceparnio is bringing the water which Ampelisca sent him to fetch. At 484 we find another opportunity for vacant stage but in 442 we find the words *sed quid ego misera video procul in litore? meum erum lenonem Siciliensemque hospitem*. The monologue of Sceparnio serves to fill in the time which the *leno* and the *hospes* consume in coming from *procul* to the stage.

A very interesting point is introduced at 688 by the words of Trachalio addressed to Palaestra and Ampelisca, *adsidite hic in ara*, and the question is, when did the girls leave the *ara*, and the stage? As noted above, the scene-headings are useless for they do not mention the girls, since the girls are mutes. They are on the stage at 707, and we find scattering references to them as far as 882. Possibly they leave at 885, when Plesidippus takes away Labrax, though no sign of their departure is given. This theory is rendered tenable by the words of the Lorarius¹⁸ and by those of Daemones.¹⁹

There is apparent vacant stage at 906 as Daemones has spoken a monologue and announces his departure without giving clue as to the identity of the oncoming actor, unless his words *sed Gripus servus noster quid rerum gerat miror* are intended as such a clue. Since Gripus enters at the conclusion of the monologue it is probable that Plautus meant that the words quoted above should serve as announcement of his entrance, for the development of the plot does not demand a division-point here. The stage is also apparently vacant at 1264 for both Daemones and Gripus depart, but the words of Daemones to Trachalio in 1223, *recipe te huc rusum*, serve as the announcement of the entrance of Trachalio and hence there can be no real vacant stage.

STICHUS. The division points are at 154, 401, 504, 640, and 672, thus making six divisions. Leo marks but four divisions, omitting 154 and 672, but otherwise having the same division-points. I mark a division at 154 because I do not think that

¹⁸ 879-80, *suadeo ut ad nos abeant potius, dum recipis*.

¹⁹ 1045-8, where he signifies that his wife has seen the girls, and so they must have gone to the house.

the command of Panegyris²⁰ is a sufficient sign of entrance. Gelasimus comes on unannounced and is discovered by Crocotium as is shown by her statement.²¹ At 672 we find another instance of the principle which we enunciated in the discussion of the *Bacchides*. Sangarinus and Stichus have two successive appearances which are separated by the monologue of Stephanium. She does not remain on the stage, and hence I mark a division just before the beginning of her monologue.

TRINUMMUS. The divisions of this play coincide exactly with the traditional act-divisions and with the divisions marked by Leo, with but one exception and that is 728, which is added by Leo. This at first appears to be a division-point for all the criteria are apparently in evidence, but closer examination shows that the entrance of Callicles and Megaronides was announced at 614. Stasimus remains on the stage to meet Lysiteles and Lesbonicus and, after the departure of the three, Callicles and Megaronides return. Therefore no division-point can occur at 728.

TRUCULENTUS. The division-points occur at 447, 644, 698, making four divisions. Leo obtains the same results.

VIDULARIA. This play is too fragmentary for discussion.

II

The application of the criteria to the plays of Terence may now be of interest, as his comedies were composed under conditions quite similar to those which influenced Plautus. The most recent articles which deal with the divisions in the plays of Terence are Leo, *Der Monolog*; Keym, *De Fabulis Terenti in Actus Dividendis* (Giessen, 1911); Flickinger, *XOPOY in Terence's Hcauton* (*Classical Philology*, VII, p. 24 ff.); and Skutsch, *XOPOY bei Terenz*, *Hermes* 47. p. 141 ff.

The traditional division of the plays of Terence into five acts each has been rejected with good reason by commentators, and both Leo and Keym have endeavored to locate the original divisions. Leo divided the plays using the same criterion which he had used for Plautus, and Keym concluded that the plays should be divided into three acts each. My discussion of Plautus

²⁰ Gelasimum huc arcessito.

²¹ hic ille est parasitus.

showed that the occurrence of the monologue was not an unfailing criterion, and the arguments there adduced have equal weight with regard to Leo's division of the plays of Terence. Keym's thesis has already been reviewed by Flickinger¹ who showed that the tripartite division made by Keym was not tenable. The field is therefore open for a new attempt to find the original divisions in the plays of Terence. For the sake of uniformity and convenience, I shall use the numbering of the lines which is given in the edition of Tyrrell.

ANDRIA. This play has but two parts and the division-point is just after 819, coincident with the beginning of Act V. Leo would divide the play at 227, 300 (possibly), and 625. A brief examination will show that there can be no division-point at any of these places. At 226 Davos says, *sed Mysis ab ea egreditur*, and hence no division-point can occur here as the entrance of the oncoming actor is announced. The same contention holds true of both 300 and 625, as in both of these cases Pamphilus remains on the stage, and so the stage cannot be said to be vacant. Keym's division into three acts is as follows: 1-300, 301-819, 820-981. It has just been shown that 300 cannot be a division point and so the three act division for this play falls to the ground.

HEAUTON TIMOROUMENOS. This play has five division-points at 170, 409, 873, and 1002. Flickinger originally announced the break at 170.² 409 is coincident with the ending of Act II and 872 with that of Act IV. Leo divides the play at 229, 409, 748, and 873. 229 cannot be a division-point as the stage is not vacant for Clitipho does not leave; the same is true of 748 as Syrus remains on the stage aside. Keym's divisions are 1-409, 410-872, 873-1067; he passes over 170 and so his first division is really the sum of two divisions; he also passes over 1002, and there can be no doubt that this is a division point as all the criteria are in evidence.

EUNUCHUS. The division-points according to our criteria are 206, 538, 614, and 816, thus making five divisions. Leo finds but two "*Einschnittē*," 538 and 615, which are correct, but he does not notice the other two. Keym's divisions are 1-390, 391-816, 817-1094, his argument being wholly derived from the

¹ Class. Phil. VII, p. 499.

² op. cit.

development of the plot. A division-point cannot occur at 390 for Parmeno remains on the stage.

PHORMIO. There are four divisions with division-points at 152, 566, and 819. Leo's division-points are 152, 314, 566, and 765. 314 cannot be a division-point as Geta remains on the stage. At 762 the entrance of Demipho is announced in the words *pater adolescentis venit*, and so 765 cannot be a division-point. Keym's divisions are 1-314, 315-566, 567-1055. Keym's argument, *aliquantum temporis intercedere oportet*, is not valid with regard to 314.

HECYRA. This play has six divisions with division-points at 197, 280, 515, 576, and 798. Leo has five "*Einschnitte*," 122, 280, 515, 576, and 798, which agree with the divisions established by our own criteria, the first alone excepted, and 122 must be a typographical error for 197. Keym's divisions are 1-280, 281-576, 577-880. His first division is again the sum of two divisions, for 197 is certainly a division-point.

ADELPHOE. This play contains eight divisions with division-points at 154, 287, 354, 516, 591, 712, and 786. Leo divides the play at 154, 287, 516, 712, and 854. Barring certain omissions, the only difference between Leo's divisions and those established by our criteria is that he passes over 786 and includes 854; this cannot be a division-point as Demea remains on the stage. Keym's divisions are 1-287, 288-712, 713-997. It is true that these divisions all end at correct division-points, but Keym passes over division-points which are apparently certain in his endeavor to force the play into a tripartite division.

